

The Premier replied that it was impossible to put a value on lands so far remote from transportation. Mr. Hanna retorted that they were asked to put through a very important piece of legislation without any information to enable them to give a reasonable vote. It was proposed to give away 6,000 acres of land per mile, and the Premier could not say whether it was worth fifty cents or five dollars per acre. It was paternalism or some otherism run mad.

#### Mr. Whitney's Charge.

Mr. Whitney said it was recklessness run mad. They had not had one jot or tittle of information given to them with relation to this grant. There had never been such an outrageous proposition submitted to the House as this one. Did the Government think it could compel the Grand Trunk to remain in leading strings and repeat what was done in North Perth?

It might be that the Premier thought that by some pocus pocus he could bring on a dissolution and go to the country with the support of the Dominion Alliance, the liquor men from top to bottom, the James Bay Company and the Grand Trunk Company. No other reason than this could be imagined. "I venture to say, and I am prepared to stand by it, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company never asked for this grant. I stop there, prepared to go on at some future time whenever it may be suggested as it is now suggested that my statement is not correct." Mr. Whitney concluded by moving that the grant of \$2,000 per mile and 6,000 acres per mile for the line from Thunder Bay to the intersection of the Grand Trunk Pacific be struck out.

#### Necessary For Ontario.

Mr. Conmee said this was a line to connect the Grand Trunk Pacific with navigation on the great lakes. It was thoroughly in the interests of Ontario to reach out and tap that line in order that the grain and other products of the west might come down into the cities and towns of the Province. The line was necessary if the trade of the west was not to be carried away from Ontario.

Mr. Whitney—It is more important that North Perth should be carried.

Mr. Hugh Clark asserted that there was not a shadow of excuse for the grant. It was a pure gratuity to the Grand Trunk Pacific to enable them to build a line in competition with the Temiskaming Railway, owned by the Province.

#### Insinuation Resented.

Hon. Mr. Gibson resented the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. "I state on behalf of the Government and the Liberal party," he said, "that we are a little larger and wider in our views as to matters of public policy than to be influenced by the consideration of what effect a measure may have on an individual constituency. I wonder if my hon. friend takes that view of important public matters as they arise? I wonder if he has spent the greater part of this session in opposing a bill simply because the Soo was lost to the Opposition at a bye-election? (Applause.) The hon. gentleman stated with the greatest positiveness that no request had been made for this subsidy. I deny it. I assert, on the other hand, that absolutely positive requests have been made by those in authority in interviews with the Government; deputations have been in the Council chamber over and over again, urging that this grant be made."

They could not have too many branch lines if Ontario was to get the full benefit of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The value of the land granted would be simply the value that would be imparted to it by the building of the railways. It had absolutely no value at the present time. He was prepared to stake his political reputation on the statement that no better disposition could be made of the lands that formed the subject of this subsidy. The Government had not been influenced in making this proposal by any consideration other

than the best interests of the Province.

The Premier also spoke of the importance of the road, and the amendment was declared lost on division.

Mr. Whitney had still another amendment. He moved that a similar clause to that contained in the Dominion agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific be inserted in this bill, to provide that in the event of the Province taking over the road at any time the amount of the subsidy should be deducted from the purchase price. The Premier saw no objection to the amendment, and the clause was therefore inserted.

The bill was then given its third reading on division.

#### Law Reform.

Mr. Whitney, on the motion to go into supply, moved in amendment that the House condemn the inaction of the Government in the matter of law reform, and especially its failure to act on the statement of the Attorney-General four years ago, that at the next session he would introduce a comprehensive measure of reform regarding County and Division Courts. He declared that the people of this Province would not wait much longer for a simplification of methods and reduction of expenses.

Hon. Mr. Gibson said that he had not heard from any law association any demand for reform in the last few years. The bill which he introduced four years ago applied to the higher courts rather than to the lower. He thought that as a result of the presentations of deputations and of the deprecatory course of the Opposition he had better withdraw the bill for the time being. Since then there was no demand for law reform. The motion was lost on division.

Mr. Matheson remarked that the total expenditure for the year was \$5,305,000, which was \$1,600,000 larger than in 1899, when Hon. Mr. Ross became Premier and Treasurer. The total receipts were \$5,624,000, of which \$1,500,000 came from the sale of timber limits, leaving a normal revenue of \$4,124,000. There was, therefore, a deficit of \$1,180,000, notwithstanding all the increased taxation.

The Premier protested against the figuring which imposed such a distressing burden. They had heard for years predictions of direct taxation, and still the people were thoroughly comfortable, jolly and happy, and Canadians were never more prosperous.

#### The Gamey Case.

Mr. Gamey moved that the House regrets the payment to Chancellor Boyd and Chief Justice Falconbridge of \$3,500, being at the rate of \$125 per day for twenty-seven days, while they were in receipt of pay as Judges of the High Court. He thought there was something sinister in regard to it. Their payment was not arranged for until after the work was done. If it appeared satisfactory they were to be paid.

Hon. Mr. Gibson said that the calculation of \$125 per day was not correct, for weeks had been spent in analyzing, classifying and digesting the evidence. The sum of \$75 per day would be more like it. It was true the Judges were under salary, but that was no reason why they should not be paid for extra work. If they were paid at the rate of \$75 per day it would be less than the eminent counsel received, namely, \$100 per day. Eminent counsel were an expensive luxury nowadays. It was easy to charge that a bargain was made, but he thought no one else than the member who made it would attach much importance to it. The payment was amply justifiable under the circumstances.

Mr. Whitney agreed with Mr. Gamey that the payment was too high, and he hoped that this would sound the death knell of the use by the Government of the judiciary for such purposes. The motion was lost on division.

In supply a number of amendments on items which had been discussed from time to time were made by the Opposition and declared lost on division. One of them was to reduce by \$10,000 the price of the land for the London Asylum. Hon. Mr. Stratton remarked that the adjoining property had been sold for

\$300 per acre.

The Premier, in reply to Dr. Pyne, said that the Government did not want to disclose the price offered for the Temiskaming Railway bonds, as it might affect their credit.

#### The Jennison Bill.

The famous Jennison bill for the possession of the Kaministiquia water-power was the last item on the programme, and it led to a two hours' discussion. Hon. Mr. Harcourt, who moved the second reading, said that he did so in the absence of the promoter, Mr. Cameron (Fort William), and without committing himself to the principle of it. He despaired at the present stage of the session of doing justice to all the suggested amendments.

Then the trouble began. Pages of amendments were offered by Mr. Conmee, Mr. Cameron (Huron), Mr. Barber, Mr. St. John and others, and it was obvious that if the House were to adjourn that afternoon, or even that night, no intelligent discussion of them all could take place.

Dr. Nesbitt thought that the Government should appoint a hydraulic engineer to investigate the whole question, especially with regard to damages, and therefore, moved the six months' hoist.

Mr. Whitney asked whether the Government was a party to throwing out the bill.

Mr. Barber pointed out that by the six months' hoist the legislation of 1902 would remain in force, leaving the Clergue interests in possession and the Jennison interests out.

Mr. Conmee began to discuss amendments at length, but was met with interruptions and cries of "time" from all parts of the House.

Mr. Whitney wanted to know if this was the return the Opposition got for aiding the Government all day in expediting business.

The Premier expressed regret that Mr. Conmee did not say what he had to say in less time. He was grateful to the Opposition for their assistance in clearing up the work of the session. The Attorney-General thought that the bill might be dropped this session and engineers appointed to investigate and report next session. (Loud cries of "No," "No.") The Premier added that this was the worst tangled water-power legislation that ever came before the House. If he had his way he would like to get all the property back again into the possession of the Crown.

Dr. Nesbitt's six months' hoist was then defeated by 11 yeas to 28 nays, and the bill was read a second time.

Amidst disorder and interruptions, amendments large both in number and in quantity were added in committee. Some of them were agreed to by Mr. Jennison and the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William, and others were strongly opposed by the promoter. What the net effect will be on the bill can hardly be determined until the amendments are all printed and studied.

Hon. Mr. Stratton remarked that it was understood that the House might reconsider next session anything prejudicial to the public interest. The third reading was carried at a few minutes to 6, and the House adjourned until Tuesday at 3 p.m., when the formal prorogation will take place.